

JPRS 74224

21 September 1979

China Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 18



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		1. REPORT NO. JPRS 74224	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle CHINA REPORT: POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS, No. 18		5. Report Date 21 September 1979		6.
7. Author(s)		8. Performing Organization Rept. No.		
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract(C) or Grant(G) No. (C) (G)		
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered 14.		
15. Supplementary Notes				
16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words) This serial report contains political, sociological and military information on China.				
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors CHINA International Affairs Party and State Military and Public Security Sociological, Education and Culture				
b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms c. COSATI Field/Group SD, 5K, 15				
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22161		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 49	
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price	

(See ANSA-E39.1B)

OPTIONAL FORM 272 (4-77)
 (Formerly NTIS-35)
 Department of Commerce

21 September 1979

CHINA REPORT
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 18

CONTENTS**PAGE****PARTY AND STATE**

Importance of Stability, Unity Discussed (WEN HUI BAO, 17 Jul 79).....	1
Factionalism Linked to Poor Work Style in Party (Chang Di; GONGREN RIBAO, 1 Aug 79).....	6
Lawyer's Role in China's Judicial System Established (An Zhonghuang, Huang Zhimin; BEIJING RIBAO, 23 Jul 79). .	9
Need for Lower Levels To Discuss Truth Criterion Stressed (TIANJIN RIBAO, 15 Jul 79).....	12

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Reform of Social System Advocated (Xiao Lu; ZHEXUE YANJIU, 25 Jul 79).....	16
'Public Servants of Society' Discussed (Lin Pi; BEIJING RIBAO, 17 Jul 79).....	25
Importance of Dialectical Materialism Stressed (ZHEXUE YANJIU, 25 Jul 79).....	30
Promoting Study of Religion According to Marxism Urged (Ren Jiyu; ZHEXUE YANJIU, 25 Apr 79).....	35
Observations Made on Class Essence of Truth (Sun Xianyuan; ZHEXUE YANJIU, 25 Apr 79).....	43

PARTY AND STATE

IMPORTANCE OF STABILITY, UNITY DISCUSSED

Shanghai WEN HUI BAO in Chinese 17 Jul 79 p 1

[Article: "An Important Issue That Concerns the Overall Situation"]

[Text] In his "Report on the Work of the Government" delivered to the Second Session of the Fifth National People's Congress, Comrade Hua Guofeng pointed out: "The development of modernization in stability and unity is in the fundamental interests of all the people and all of our nationalities, it affects the overall situation of the whole nation, and it is the supreme political task for the present and for a long time to come." It could be said that this is the summarization of the lessons of many years of experience, and that it is also the aspiration of all the people of the country, requiring our manifold comprehension and earnest adherence.

We have carried out 30 years of socialist revolution and socialist construction, and yet, to our surprise, we are still so far behind the most advanced levels of the world. If we do not resolutely make modernization the key part of our work and do not accelerate the pace of the four modernizations, the national power will not be strengthened, the people's lives will not improve, and it will not be possible to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat. And, if we want to carry out modernization, we must first have a situation of stability and unity, and this stability and unity must persist for a long time. This is obvious.

However, some of our comrades are not secure in their minds about the possibility of carrying out modernization in stability and unity. They give their wholehearted support to changing the emphasis of the work and eagerly hope that the country will become powerful and prosperous, but accompanying their every thought is the misgiving: who knows when there will be a relapse? It could be said that this is a case of "losing the key and getting flustered." This kind of lingering fear is understandable, because people always view problems in light of their own personal experience. For a relatively long period of time, because of problems of perception and errors in the direction of work, in enlarging the class struggle there have in fact been reversals that should not have occurred. When Lin Biao and the "gang of four" ran amuck especially, they deliberately

misrepresented the Marxist theory of class struggle and promoted a left extremist line, saying that class struggle is "bigger than anything, more important than anything, higher than anything, prior to anything." They artificially manufactured a counterrevolutionary class struggle, inciting you to struggle against me, me to struggle with you, to struggle year after year, month after month, day after day, until everything was in chaos and everyone had been intimidated by struggle. In more than two years since breaking up the "gang of four," we have fundamentally brought order out of chaos on this problem, but people's perceptions have not overtaken the objective situation that has developed.

Comrade Mao Zedong said: "There are things that we feel and cannot immediately understand, but a thing that is understood can be felt even more deeply." The importance of the development of modernization in stability and unity is like this. The basic principle of Marxism tells us that the existence of classes is only concerned with a certain historical period in the development of production, and class struggle is always carried on in the service of economic liberation; the proletariat's purpose in carrying on class struggle is to break the shackles of the old production relationships, to liberate and develop the productive force. In the 30 years since the liberation, the party has led all the people of the country in resolutely carrying out the socialist revolution, and the class situation in our country has undergone a fundamental change. The landlords and rich peasants, as classes, have already been destroyed, and the capitalist class no longer exists. Most of the members of these classes having some laboring capability have already been converted into self-supporting laborers in a socialist society. This is the great result of the socialist revolution. Because of this fundamental change in the class relationships, it has been determined that the principal domestic contradiction is no longer class struggle, but has to do with protecting and encouraging the development of the productive force under the new production relationships, and with mobilizing and organizing the broadest masses of the people in the great struggle for the four modernizations. In the course of the socialist revolution, the extent of the class struggle, instead of getting larger and larger, got smaller and smaller. Class enemies, instead of growing in number, diminished, and the general trend of the class struggle, instead of becoming sharper, relaxed. This is the objective reason why the key points of the country's work must be quickly converted to socialist modernization. Because of this, the long-term maintenance of stability and unity for the development of modernization is not a temporary requirement, and it is not just our subjective desire, but has been determined by the objective situation of the balance of class forces, it is an inevitable historical development, and it is the aspiration of all the people of the country.

Of course, this is not to say that there is no longer any class struggle in our country, for we still have our counterrevolutionary elements and enemy agents, there are still criminal elements and degenerates who damage the socialist economy seriously, the new exploiting elements who engage in graft, embezzlement, speculation, and profiteering, and there are some

remnants of the old exploiting elements and of the "gang of four." As long as this small group of enemies carries out disruptive activities against socialism, we must continue to carry out economic, political, and ideological class struggle. However, our class struggle should surround a central task of socialist modernization and should serve that central task, and moreover, it must depend completely on the masses, must strictly observe the socialist legal system, and must certainly not be enlarged. The first fundamental problem that we must clarify in our study of the documents of the Second Session of the Fifth National People's Congress is the correct analysis of our country's class relationships and the principal domestic contradiction in the present stage. Only after clarifying this problem will we really be able to understand the necessity for developing a situation of stability and unity, its importance, and its objective foundations, and only then will we be completely liberated from the influence of the left extremist line of Lin Biao and the "gang of four" and overcome our lingering fears.

How can we assure the development of modernization in stability and unity? The answer is by resolutely developing socialist democracy and perfecting the socialist legal system. To realize the four modernizations, we must simultaneously realize a political democratization, this is the summarization of the lessons and experience of a long period of practice. Just as comrade Hua Guofeng has said, "The original intention of democracy was rule by the majority, and socialist democracy is the historically unprecedented rule, in both name and in reality, by an overwhelming majority." However, during the period when Lin Biao and the "gang of four" were rampaging about, where was the people's right to speak, and what legal guarantees were there for the people's democratic rights? The reason stability and unity was not achieved was just that the legal system and democracy were destroyed, creating a long-term chaos. Stability and unity can only be encouraged by the development of democracy; stability and unity can only be guaranteed by perfection of the legal system. Without democracy and a system of laws, there will be no stability and unity, there will be no socialism, there will be no four modernizations, and there will be neither national power and prosperity nor people's well-being. The idea that we cannot develop democracy if we are to have stability and unity, or that stability and unity must be sacrificed to the development of democracy, is mistaken. If we want to achieve political stability and unity, we must require the ideological liberation of all the people, speaking without inhibition, with minds at ease. Without democracy, not a crow nor a sparrow will be heard, people will not be able to express their opinions directly, activism will be inhibited, and the political foundations for stability and unity will be lost. During the rampages of Lin Biao and the "gang of four," weren't the people suppressed to the point where, almost like Lin Daiyu entering the Palace of Jia, they "could not utter one sentence more"? Although this was determined by the requirements of their counterrevolution, it conversely tells us how important the development of democracy is to sustained stability and unity. If we are to fully implement socialist democracy, not only must

we systematize, order, and discipline socialist democracy, we must also legalize it. This is what our party and people have come to realize in exchange for the blood of many martyrs like Zhang Zhixin. Without a complete system of law, the development of democracy can be no more than a scrap of paper. Socialist democracy must certainly be guaranteed by the socialist legal system. We must adequately perceive this problem as we study the documents of the Second Session of the Fifth National People's Congress, and we must resolutely protect the socialist democracy and system of laws through concrete actions.

The development of the four modernizations in stability and unity, besides calling for determined struggle against the various class enemies who would destroy socialism, also requires that we struggle unremittingly against the bureaucracy and anarchism that violates democracy and the legal system. Because our country was ruled by feudalism for a long time and is economically and culturally backward, there is a tendency to engender autocracy, bureaucracy, a "special privilege" mentality, and a paternalistic style. On top of this, a few years ago Lin Biao and the "gang of four" poisoned the people by sticking socialist labels on feudalism, destroyed the party's excellent tradition by the false theory of "considering the gang to be the party," and caused some cadres to become contaminated by unhealthy tendencies without being conscious of it. When the masses enthusiastically proposed rational suggestions, they disdained to attend to it; a report sent up was like a stone sinking into the ocean; they directed work without investigation or research, directing in blind subjectivism; they refused to hear conflicting opinions on anything, but proceeded arbitrarily; bourgeois characteristics appeared indistinctly; they sought privilege, putting it before the happiness of everyone else, etc. The masses were greatly offended by this. If we do not make great efforts to sweep away this bureaucratic detritus and unhealthy tendencies, it will not be possible to develop democracy fully, so it will be impossible to mobilize the activism of the broad masses and impossible to develop modernization in stability and unity. At the same time, a minimum requirement of stability and unity is a normal social order, order to work, and order to production. If we raise an unrestrained ruckus at every turn to solve the problems of some individual, obstruct communications, attack organizations, and disrupt public order, how can we carry out the four modernizations in stability and unity? Therefore, we cannot easily neglect the continued cleanup of the poison of anarchism.

The purpose of stability and unity is to implement the four modernizations, but conversely, we cannot consolidate and develop a stable and unified political situation unless we work on the economy. The destructiveness of class enemies, as well as the persistence of bureaucracy and anarchy, are factors in instability and disunity. Therefore, we should see that many present problems are the result of long-term destructiveness of the "gang of four," are created by economic backwardness, such as employment problems, welfare problems, etc. These problems cannot be completely solved at a single stroke before there has been some improvement in production, and the solution of these problems must certainly be carried out in strict

accordance with party policies. Of course, if we want to work well and actively, problems that can be solved should be solved as quickly as is practical; those problems that cannot be solved immediately should be explained patiently. The comrades must understand that the solution of these problems, fundamentally, lies in a down-to-earth development of production and implementation of modernization in stability and unity. If we carry out various measures contrary to the interests of stability and unity just because the interests of some individual are temporarily unsatisfied, it is bound to affect and even harm to the overall situation of socialist modernization. In this way, the problems not only will go unsolved, but will get worse. The broad masses will understand the truth of this through study of the documents of the Second Session, Fifth National People's Congress.

In his closing speech to the Second Session of the Fifth National People's Congress, comrade Ye Jianying said: "The internal unity of the people and the political stability of the society are the principal prerequisites for the development of socialist modernization, and are in the basic interests of the people of the whole country." We must certainly understand, get a good grasp of, and put into practice this important issue that concerns the overall situation.

9284

CSO: 4005

PARTY AND STATE

FACTIONALISM LINKED TO POOR WORK STYLE IN PARTY

Beijing GONGREN RIBAO in Chinese 1 Aug 79 p 4

[*"Random Talk"* article by Chang Di [7022 4564]: "Eliminate Factionalism, March in Unison Toward Four Modernizations"]

[Text] If we want to construct the four modernizations, it is necessary that there be a stable and united political situation. Without this, there is no way to realize the four modernizations.

At present, there is something that is secretly wrecking stability and unity, viz., factionalism. What is factionalism? It is the ideology of the bourgeoisie and the feudal trade associations; it is expanded individualism. It and the party spirit of the proletariat are diametrically opposed, as incompatible as fire and water. Factionalism can be expressed in the following words, "for one's personal interests," putting the interests of one's faction or clique above everything else. If factionalism is not eradicated, then it will be difficult for the party spirit to exist. If there is factionalism, then the study and handling of problems will inevitably only proceed from the faction's interests, and the right and wrong of everything will be the faction's right and wrong. The result will be that many matters will be turned upside down.

Today's manifestation of factionalism is multifaceted. For example: A pragmatic attitude is taken toward the party Central Committee's general and specific policies and its instructions. What is firmly complied with is what is advantageous to the faction: if there is no advantage, then no attention at all is paid to them, or they are only lightly touched upon in the discussion of affairs, even to the extent of causing a "family breakup" of integrated policies and instructions, stressing one part and deliberately "neglecting" another part. In selecting cadres for tasks, "people are appointed by faction." For people of one's own faction, those who are ugly are said to be beautiful, and they are pushed forward and elevated, promoted and put in important positions; for people of other factions, even though it be obvious that they are good comrades, they are said not to be worth much, and they are pressed down and constrained, and

arbitrarily rejected. In implementing policies, for people of one's own faction, problems are solved with extraordinary simplicity, and also "neatly and tidily"; for people of other factions, fault is found where no fault exists, and they are tugged this way and that, and ways are thought of to keep them hanging in "tail" positions. In relations with the masses, the faction is a relative. For the masses of one's own faction, there is affection and complete trust; the masses of other factions are always looked upon as being perverse, and their correct opinions are not accepted, old grudges are brooded upon and an opportunity is sought to strike out at them, and things are made hard for them. Within the leading group each person goes his own way, each person plays his own tune, and there is no mutual help but rather mutual undercutting. Whether it is in raising wages, recruiting workers, attending university or seeking housing, all possible "consideration" is given to one's own faction, wrecking party discipline and state law.

From what has been stated above, if factionalism exists in a unit or area, how can there be stability and unity? How can people think about the four modernizations and concentrate on carrying them out with one heart and one mind? Factionalism is a kind of corrosive agent that corrodes our party and revolutionary ranks. It also encourages the spreading of every kind of unhealthy tendency. It causes some party members, even leading cadres, to deviate from the party's position, wreck the party's organizational principles, and severely damage the party's authority. It causes dissension and discord, laxness and dispiritedness among party members, among cadres, among the masses and between the masses and the party organizations. Communists serve the people; if factionalism is not eradicated, then they cannot serve all the people. In order to bring into full play the fighting force of all levels of party organizations, unite the people of the entire country, and work in concert to accelerate the construction of socialist modernization, it is necessary to thoroughly eliminate factionalism.

How can we eliminate factionalism? Factionalism was stirred up by Lin Biao and the "gang of four." It was their "magic weapon" to corrupt and break up the party, split the revolutionary ranks, foster a bourgeois factionalist setup, and usurp the party and seize power. Although the "gang of four" has been smashed, its pernicious influence has still not been completely eradicated. The important task in strengthening the party spirit and overcoming factionalism is to more deeply criticize the extreme left ideological trend and eradicate the pernicious influence of Lin Biao and the "gang of four."

Factionalism and the party's work style are closely linked. A great quantity of facts prove that where the party's work style is good, where the work style of the leading cadres, especially the principal ones, is honest, there factionalism is easily eliminated. Conversely, in all cases of units in which factionalism is serious, this factionalism cannot be separated from an incorrect work style in the party. Some factionalism has a direct connection with factionalism among members of the party committee. Where the

party's work style is good, where the work style of the party's leading cadres is honest, there the factionalism among the masses is not hard to overcome. Let us start by maintaining good party discipline and work style, and carry forward the party's fine traditions, unceasingly strengthen the party spirit, overcome factionalism, strengthen unity and with one heart and one mind march toward the four modernizations.

CSO: 4005

PARTY AND STATE

LAWYER'S ROLE IN CHINA'S JUDICIAL SYSTEM ESTABLISHED

Beijing BEIJING RIBAO in Chinese 23 Jul 79 pp 1, 6

[Article by XINHUA NEWS AGENCY Reporters An Zhonghuang [1344 0112 4106] and Huang Zhimin [7306 2535 2404]: "People's Lawyers Serve the People--An Interview with the Beijing Municipal Lawyers Association"]

[Text] The "Criminal Prosecution Law of the People's Republic of China," adopted at the second meeting of the Fifth National Congress, has definitely established the use of lawyers in China. The masses of people are quite interested in the work of lawyers, and wish to know the nature, functions, rights, and obligations of lawyers. For this reason, the reporters went to interview the officials of the Beijing Municipal Lawyers Association.

The office of the lawyers association was a busy place. The lawyers were deeply absorbed in their work. Some were reading documents; others drafting investigation summaries; still others preparing defending arguments; and still others writing replies to legal enquiries from the public.

These lawyers have been working at the Beijing Municipal Legal Advisory Office since October 1978. After the establishment of the Beijing Municipal Lawyers Association, their work became much heavier. "Up to now, they have handled more than 20 criminal cases for the defendants, replied to 500 letters from the public, and answered numerous questions from people who visited the office. The association has more business than it can handle. Zhou Yuxi [0719 3768 3886], deputy director of the association, dropped his work at hand and told the reporters: "The lawyers association has just been established. Lawyers are few, but the work is heavy. However, we are highly enthusiastic. As we think about the importance of a lawyer's service, the need of the state for such service, and how welcome it is to the people, the more we work, the higher is our morale."

As early as the 1950's, a preparatory committee for a lawyers association was formed in Beijing. Chen Shouji [7115 1343 0001], director of the Beijing Municipal Lawyers Association, was the director of the preparatory committee. This nationally known jurist is now the head of the law department of Beijing University, and a member of the Judicial Committee of the Standing Committee of the People's Congress. He is 72 years old. Recalling the

history of the lawyers association, Professor Chen said that back in 1956 there were several hundred legal advisory offices throughout the country staffed by lawyers. Directly under the preparatory committee there were three legal advisory offices staffed by 139 full and part time lawyers. They rendered a lot of services beneficial to the people, and had some influence among the people. After 1957, the responsible persons of the preparatory committee and many lawyers were wrongfully attacked. As a result, the function of lawyers as an institution and the services of lawyers were negated. When Lin Biao and the "gang of four" were at the peak of their power, they wanted to smash the public prosecution law; labelled the lawyer system "a bourgeois thing"; and accused lawyers who defended their clients in criminal cases of "abandoning their own stand-point," "trying to acquit the criminals," and "rendering service to counterrevolutionary elements." The lawyer system was destroyed. The signs of the preparatory committee of the Beijing Municipal Lawyers Association and the legal advisory offices were knocked down. The lawyers could do nothing but look for some other job to make a living. Now that the Beijing lawyers association is finally established, it has great significance for the development of China's socialist democracy and her socialist judicial system.

During the interview, the lawyers told the reports that the lawyer system was originally started by the bourgeois class against the judicial tyranny of feudalist dictators. It served the interest of the bourgeois class. At the same time, the broad masses of working people suffered greatly from many "shysters." The socialist lawyer system is at the service of the proletarian class and the working people. Lawyers are workers of the state. To be a lawyer of the people, one must insist on the stand of the people. Essentially, a lawyer must be faithful to the law in his activities, adhere to truth and facts, and be loyal to the interest of the people. The main function of a lawyer is to accept the trust of a client or the appointment of a people's court to act as a defense counsel or agent in a lawsuit. To defend the accused in criminal cases is especially an important service of lawyers. To answer people's inquiries about law, to provide opinions for resolving legal problems to prepare documents for lawsuits or legal action, to be legal counsel of government agencies, enterprises, industrial units and civic bodies, and to give publicity to the socialist judicial system are among the functions of lawyers. As a result of the development of our country's foreign trade and ocean transportation, lawyers of our country may take part in lawsuits involving foreigners concerning trade, insurance and maritime affairs. They may also be called upon to maintain our country's sovereignty and economic interest, and protect the legal rights of Chinese citizens and overseas Chinese for enhancing friendly relations with other countries.

The lawyers of the Beijing Municipal Lawyers Association worked hard, earnestly executed the functions of lawyers, made the functions of lawyers manifest, did many things beneficial to the people, and received praises from the people. Lawyer Jiang Hao [3068 3185] and woman lawyer Zhou Naxin [0719 4780 2450] once defended a client involved in a robbery case. Before

the trial, they studied related reports and talked to the defendant who was in jail. They found that the defendant not only voluntarily admitted to his own crime, but also persuaded other inmates to admit to their wrong doings. As a result of this defendant's cooperation, a suspect voluntarily admitted to a theft of several thousand Jen Min Pi. This admission led to the resolution of a bigger unresolved case. While defending their client, the lawyers told the court all the facts and pleaded leniency for the defendant. The atmosphere in the court suddenly became lively. Both the judge and audience regarded the lawyers' arguments as based on facts, reasonable and forceful. A just verdict was finally rendered after taking the lawyers' opinion fully into consideration. Afterwards, many fan letters were received by these two lawyers, praising the merit of the socialist lawyer system.

In mid-June, a traffic accident case was tried. Lawyer Fu Zhiren [0256 1807 0086] was the attorney for the defendant. The case involved a bus driver who killed two elderly pedestrians while they were crossing the street. The lawyer obtained all the facts after reading the reports and talking to the defendant. The lawyer used facts to analyze the causes of traffic accidents. Some were subjective; others were objective. Some were direct; others were indirect. The lawyer pleaded leniency for the defendant, on the grounds of the safety record of the defendant, his immediate attention to the victims on the scene of accident, and his good attitude in admitting his negligence. The lawyer's defense helped the court to understand the circumstances fully. The judges gave careful consideration to the accusations of the public prosecutor as well as the arguments of the defense lawyer. Finally, the bus driver was given a light sentence. The audience considered the judgment humane, reasonable and legally correct. At the same time, the defendant received an education.

During the reporters' visit at the association, the lawyers patiently answered questions from visitors, offered legal opinions, and told the parties concerned what was legal and what was illegal to do. They supported certain people for their proper and legitimate demands, while persuading others to give up their unreasonable and illegitimate demands and settle their disputes out of court in the interest of national unity and stability. Some people made inquiries about disputes with their neighbors; others asked questions about their marital troubles. The lawyers always tried to understand the situation in detail before they gave the answers.

During the interview, the reporters obtained a deep impression: the people's lawyers are for the people. They are endeavoring to protect people's democracy, and safeguard the legitimate rights of the state, the collective bodies and the individuals. The lawyers association will certainly play an important role in strengthening the socialist judicial system and promote the realization of the four modernizations program.

PARTY AND STATE

NEED FOR LOWER LEVELS TO DISCUSS TRUTH CRITERION STRESSED

Tianjin TIANJIN RIBAO in Chinese 15 Jul 79 pp 1,3

[Article by our commentator: "Basic Levels Must Also Thoroughly Discuss the Criterion for Truth"]

[Text] When discussing the question of practice being the sole criterion for testing truth, leading cadres of some basic-level units believe that this is a task for the leading organs and theoretical workers and that it is not important for the basic-level units to discuss the question. The report of a lumber yard commune which insisted that practice is the sole criterion for testing truth particularly deserves reading by comrades who entertain such thinking, and they may acquire some enlightenment from the report.

For more than a year, the question of practice being the sole criterion for testing truth has been discussed in newspapers and periodicals, and this is an important matter concerning the political life of our people. The Party's Third Plenary Session gave a full evaluation of the importance of this discussion. Now, in summing up practical work, it is necessary for the ideological and theoretical workers, the great masses of industrial and agricultural workers, the practical workers on the industrial and agricultural front, the leading organs, and especially the basic-level units, to deeply discuss the criterion question. As all of us know, when we talk about practice, we refer to the social practice of society and the practice of the masses, which include production struggle, class struggle and scientific experimentation. The broadest, richest and most direct arenas for practice in these three great revolutionary movements are located at the basic levels. Basic levels are the battlefields of the great laboring masses and the first line of practice. All of our policies, measures, plans and programs must be tested there against the practice of the masses. The ultimate test and verification of each event or each understanding of a problem as being true or not is the revolutionary practice of the broad masses. In the basic-level work, the leading cadres, in close relationship with the broad masses, have the most right to speak out on the criterion for truth. We should treasure this right to speak out and exercise it well. For this purpose, we must first understand thoroughly the question of the criterion for truth.

Therefore, we must not consider discussion of the criterion problem as a matter of no concern to ourselves, irrelevant and unimportant.

"Social practice can be the only criterion for truth." This is the fundamental principle of Marxist epistemology, and is correct everywhere in the world. For our large number of cadres this should be a matter of common-sense and should not become an issue. However, for many years, because of the interference and disruption caused by Lin Biao and the "gang of four," people have become confused and unable to distinguish right from wrong, and the relationship between theory and practice has become a major problem. As in the actual conditions of the lumber yard commune and many other units, when the comrades encountered in actual work problems different from those described in books or contrary to what certain leaders had said, they did not dare to deal with or even think about them. Some comrades did not dare to take certain actions which were clearly beneficial to the masses and proven correct in practice, simply because the leaders had not said to do so. On the contrary, some stubbornly adhered to measures which were not suitable for the actual conditions and which were contrary to the interests of the masses, unless the leaders told them to do otherwise. For some matters which were clearly within the scope of their authority to make decisions, they requested instructions from superior levels; no action was taken without the consent of superior levels. Some comrades even said: "Testing by practice is inferior to testing by leaders. A pass issued by leaders is more useful than any other thing." There are also some comrades who do not respect practice, usually do not study or conduct research, do not listen attentively to the voice of the masses, but instead shut their eyes and stop up their ears, make subjective assumptions and stick to their old ways of doing things. Some comrades do not sum up experience or learn from the advanced. But instead rigidly stick to their old opinions and ways of doing things and remain unchanged in a changing situation. In summary, they give first priority to subjectivity and second to objectivity, first to theory and second to practice and first to the leaders and second to the masses. This state of affairs demonstrates the great necessity for the basic levels to deeply involve themselves in the discussion of the criterion for truth.

Certainly, it should be said that there is a considerable number of basic-level cadres who are not clear about the relationship between theory and practice and do not take practice as the first principle in this relationship. This is a problem of ideological understanding. With the disruption caused by Lin Biao and the "gang of four," for a long time they have not studied well enough the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought. They have not conscientiously studied Marxist epistemology and have not understood Chairman Mao's exposition on the relationship between knowledge and practice, between knowledge and action, and are not even clear about the meaning of "testing by practice" and "theoretical guidance." Therefore, when they hear people speak about using practice to test theory, they say angrily: "How can this be! Doesn't this negate theory?" They insist on using "theory to test theory," or at least using "theory and

practice in combination to test theory." In the discussion of the criterion for truth at the basic levels, the broad masses, and especially the basic-level leading cadres, should study conscientiously the philosophical works of Marxism-Leninism in order to understand thoroughly that practice being the sole criterion for testing truth is the fundamental principle of Marxism. Only in this way will we reduce blind obedience in work and increase the regularity of learning from experience.

In order to properly discuss the criterion for truth at the basic levels, first of all, the leading cadres at the party's basic levels must understand the meaning of this discussion, put it on the agenda, and adopt practical and effective measures to mobilize the masses for dynamic discussion, instead of relying on a few talented individuals for dull discussion and discuss it in a down-to-earth manner and not formalistically. Then they should move ahead without any hesitation, reluctance or fear. Previously, under the encouragement of the call by the Third Plenary Session of the Eleventh Party Central Committee for the Liberation of Thinking, some basic-level units adopted some appropriate measures with the support of the broad masses for discussion of the only criterion for truth being tested by practice, and thus made a promising start. Later, there appeared a bad tendency in society to negate the four basic principles, and some people mistakenly maintained that this discussion and liberation of thinking had gone too far. Thus, after making a good start, some comrades have retreated. We communists should be, unselfish, selfless and fearless; after recognizing what is good for the party and people we should insist on carrying it out. We cannot watch the way the wind blows in handling affairs or listen to rumors in dealing with problems. "A thorough-going materialist is fearless." We should follow the example of martyr Zhang Zhikin in maintaining the "five fearless" spirit and hold to the truth that is proven in practice, unshaken by winds and leaves.

The discussion at the basic levels of the question of the criterion for truth must be combined with the general mission of realizing the four modernizations, revolving around this central mission. To realize the four modernizations, to realize the Chinese style of socialist modernization is a great undertaking which cannot be accomplished by copying what is in books or by blindly copying the example of other countries. Following the guidance of Marxist-Leninist basic principles, we must start with our actual conditions, study new problems, sum up new experiences, and gradually find the surest avenue to the Chinese style of socialist modernization.

This will require that we correct our thinking and recognize the line and begin with reality, that every one of our units sums up its own experiences. For a long period of time, the practice of many basic-level units led to good experiences and created good methods. And some units, by conscientiously summing up and upholding them, obtained excellent results. Some units, however, have not conscientiously summed them up, continuing some previous practices and abandoning others without serious consideration. In discussing the question of the criterion for truth, there should

not be any empty talk; the discussion must be integrated with practical experience; in our work what has been done correctly and what has been done incorrectly; what is correct and what is incorrect? For example, should we take an absolutist view of class struggle, including in it everything and deciding to struggle against everything, or view class struggle from the reality of our country and put it in the service of the central mission of socialist modernization? In developing the movement for increasing production and practicing thrift, should we have a small number of people balance the books behind closed doors, or get moving, investigate and do research, sum up experiences, and go all out to mobilize the masses? In formulating plans, should we rely on leaders beating their chests in self-confidence, or take the mass line? In carrying out technological innovations and technological transformation, should we rely on subjective imagination and simply ask for help, or rely on the practices of the masses in order to fully tap the latent potentials of enterprises? And so forth. All of these questions pertaining to the realization of the four modernizations should be closely integrated in the discussion, making the discussion real and having it solve actual problems, and not emptily going from one theory to another.

In developing the discussion we should take further steps to throw off the spiritual yoke imposed on us by Lin Biao and the "gang of four," liberate thinking and improve the cadres' work style. Lin Biao and the "gang of four" confused our thinking, confussed our theories, and undermined the party's traditional work style. In our discussion of the criterion for truth, we must link it with each units actual problems, and make everyone recognize clearly that the criterion for testing truth is practice, not theory, not the "wishes of superior officials," and not bookish conclusions; making everyone understand that everything comes from the masses and goes to the masses, everything starts from reality--practice, knowledge, again practice, again knowledge, repeating this process in endless cycles--this is the only way for us to understand problems; and making everyone understand that integrating theory with practice and maintaining close links with the masses are our party's traditional work styles, etc.

We believe that only if we recognize the importance of the truth criterion discussion to the future and destiny of our party and our country and give it a high degree of emphasis in ideology, will we promote the liberation of our thinking and accelerate the four modernizations.

6178-R
CSO:4005

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

REFORM OF SOCIAL SYSTEM ADVOCATED

Beijing ZHUXUE YANJIU [PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH] in Chinese No 7, 25 Jul 79
pp 19-26

[Artical by Xiao Lu [2556 7627]: "Is 'Contradiction Between the Advanced Social System and the Backward Productive Forces' a Scientific Issue?"]

[Excerpts] After the serious disasters brought to our country by the sham socialism of Lin Biao and the "gang of four," people cannot help but review the past and once again ponder over the many questions of basic theories. What is the principal contradiction in our country now? How is this contradiction manifested? In connection with these questions, the issue of "contradiction between the advanced social system and the backward productive forces" is once again raised as a substitute for the "gang of four's" fallacy. This is an issue concerning the basic theory of historical materialism, and there is a very urgent need for its clarification.

This issue was first raised in 1956--when socialist transformation of agriculture, handicraft and capitalist industry and commerce had been basically completed--for the purpose of showing that class struggle no longer constituted the principal contradiction and that the most urgent and realistic need was a large-scale development of the productive forces. The use of this starting point was undoubtedly justified. In theory, however, this issue and the starting point do not form a unity.

As a concept, the socialist system, serving as a substitute for the capitalist system, should be more advanced. However, it was an indisputable fact that our productive forces were then weaker than those of the advanced capitalist countries. When people did not sufficiently understand our newly established socialist system, there is no wonder that they analyzed this "contradiction" on the basis of this fact. Today, however, we can, and should return to the true stand of historical materialism and work out a scientific conclusion by penetrating the phenomena and grasping the internal relations.

Marx always held that productive activities are the most basic form of human activities in practice.

If we look at the history of mankind, we will find it full of accounts of the rises and falls of nations, dynastic changes and political transformations with a continuity of ups and downs and upheavals. Yet productive activities have continued all along without interruption. Production has been the main distinctive feature in historical developments having decisive effects on the forms and substances of class struggles. It has been, and still is, an inherent force promoting the progress of all societies.

People have to change their environment in order to exist and are, at the same time, transformed by their changed environment. Because of the changes in the means of production, productive forces at different stages of development produce different forms of labor organization and different divisions of work. People's relationships with the instruments of labor takes different forms and, therefore, there are different forms of human cooperation. It is on this basis that social relations among people are formed. As Marx and Engels pointed out: "The various stages of development in the division of labor are just so many different forms of ownership, that is, the existing stage in the division of labor determines also the relations of individuals to one another with references to the material, instrument and production of labor." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 1, p 26)

In history, the contradiction and dislocation between the social system and the productive forces have generally been caused by the "drag" on the productive forces from the relations of production, which are formed amid the productive activities of a society and are restricted by the objective conditions left over by the former social activities. Therefore, the relations of production cannot be created according to people's subjective will before there is a demand for them by the productive forces. It is true that there have been instances of advanced social systems being set up in the backward nations which had been conquered by the advanced nations. Yet these advanced systems were not simply created out of nothing. In the first place, the advanced nations had already developed their productive forces. Secondly, imported productive forces (such as advanced farm implements, machinery, farming systems, and advanced sciences and technology) were used as the foundation of the development of indigenous productive forces. Under any circumstances, the social system can continue to exist only provided it is not separated from the productive forces. "The form of community adopted by the settling conquerors must correspond to the state of development of the productive forces." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 1, p 81)

Marx and Engels repeatedly expounded this materialistic conception of history. Their viewpoints clearly show that in any society, the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production has always been the

most basic one. Judging from the entire course of development, the productive forces are always on the dominant side of a set of contradictions. There is only one "criterion" for the relations of production, and that is the productive forces. The relationship between the productive forces and the relations of production can be either one of harmony or one of mutual obstruction, but they are never unconnected. A social system is able to survive only because of its main function in establishing or reflecting the relations of production in the form of laws. The relationship between the society and its productive forces must be either harmonious or unharmonious, because there cannot be a third choice.

Therefore, if some one claims that a society can produce an advanced system which transcends the requirements of the productive forces, in which case the contradiction between this system and the productive forces will be the main or basic contradiction in the society, this claim is obviously a violation of the materialistic conception of history. If such a claim is accepted, it will mean that a social system can be set up entirely according to people's subjective imagination and without an economic or historical foundation. Thus it would not be difficult to imagine that a capitalist system could be set up in the stone age or that a communist paradise can appear in a country of petty peasantry. If the production is backward, this should be no cause for concern, because according to these people, they can first build communism and then develop the productive forces. Will not this line or argument pave the way for the theories of "transition in poverty," of spirit as a substitute for matter and of politics as the decisive factor in economics which were in vogue when the "gang of four" were riding high? Furthermore, any agreement with this line of argument is tantamount to an open assertion that the relations of production and the superstructure do not in any way hinder the development of productive forces so that no reform in any system is necessary. At a time when there is an urgent need to reform the system which does not meet the requirements of modernization, these theories, which ignore the real contradictions, can only hinder the development of productive forces in our country.

II

How was the issue of "contradiction between the advanced social system and the backward productive forces" raised in the first place? According to certain reports, this was the outcome of a "comparison" with Western capitalist countries. The theoretical basis used by those comrades who agreed with it was what Lenin has said: "...the Russian proletariat are in advance of any Britain or any Germany as regards our political order, as regards the strength of the workers' political power, but are behind the most backward West-European country as regards organizing a good state capitalism, as regards our level of culture and the degree of material and productive preparedness for the 'introduction' of socialism." ("Selected Works of Lenin," Vol 3, p 550)

However, Lenin's thoughts, thus expressed, had nothing whatsoever to do with this type of "contradiction." First, Lenin at that time was only comparing the political system and material foundation of the Soviet regime with those of the Western capitalist countries. He did not at all consider this difference as a contradiction in the society or the contradiction between the socialist system and the productive forces. Nor did he say that the principal contradiction of a society could be discovered merely through "comparison" with another country instead of a study of the society itself or an exploration into the relationship between the productive forces and the relations of production. Secondly, the term "advanced political order" mentioned by Lenin was used only in a limited sense, that is, in the sense that the political rule resulting from the substitution for the bourgeoisie by the workers' political power would pave the way for the development of productive forces. But he never held that the social system than existing was already a perfect one, or that that system itself was so much above the requirements of the productive forces that it would insure their continual development. On the contrary, in the same article, he clearly pointed out: "No one, I think, in studying the question of the economic system of Russia, has denied its transitional character. Nor, I think, has any communist denied that the term Socialist Soviet Republic implies the determination of Soviet power to achieve the transition to socialism, and not that the new economic system is recognized as a social order." "Is it not clear that from the material economic and productive point of view, we are not yet on the 'threshold' of socialism? Is it not clear that we cannot pass through the door of socialism without crossing the 'threshold' we have not yet reached?" ("Selected Works of Lenin," Vol 3, pp 540 and 547) It was precisely because of economic necessity brought about by those backward productive forces that Lenin repeatedly stressed the need for the "supplementary means" used by capitalism for developing productive forces. Thus as the leader of Soviet Russia at that time, he adopted a series of measures for economic development. These measures were considered by the "left-wing communists" as signs of capitalist restoration.

For a certain period of time, we talked only about the struggles, but not the unity, of opposites. Instead of studying the means to resolve real existing contradictions, we artificially created more contradictions and did everything we could to intensify them. This was regarded as a panacea for solving problems. Those who believe that the problem of backwardness of productive forces can be solved by artificially creating an "advanced socialist system" as the opposite in a set of contradictions must have been influenced by such metaphysical ideas. Acting on their theory, people will once again come to such an absurd conclusion as "production will naturally improve as long as the revolution is well carried out," because, they may ask, "Do not things develop through contradictions?" True, revolution symbolizes violent struggles in contradictions and certainly plays a tremendous role in history. But "revolution means the liberation of productive forces" and is, at the same time, a process of the resolution of contradictions. Through a revolution, the old contradictions will be resolved and the society will develop. Of course, new contradictions will continue to emerge, and the society will continue to develop in the process of constant resolutions of contradictions. If the ruling class is able to take the initiative of readjusting and reforming

the relations of production which excessively hinder the function of the productive forces, the productive forces will still develop. This shows that revolution is not the only means (though the ultimate means) of resolving contradictions. In any circumstance, resolving contradictions and creating contradictions are entirely different.

It must be pointed out that the original intention of the people who raised this issue was to stress the important duty of the society to develop productive forces. However, as Stalin pointed out: "All societies, either capitalist or the predecessors of a capitalist society, should be concerned with the general increase of labor productivity." ("Collected Works of Stalin," Vol 12, p 73) This should be the responsibility of all societies, and there should be no need to create contradictions as a condition for the productive forces to develop. Some comrades feel that we should adapt the development of productive forces to a system set up beforehand instead of reforming the system to keep pace with the development of productive forces. In their opinion, it is not the purpose of a revolution or a new system to liberate the productive forces; on the contrary, the productive forces should be developed in order to resolve the contradiction between their own backwardness and the advanced social system. This theory, though somehow plausible, actually stands the function of a society on its head, because it contends that the productive forces should be subordinated to the relations of production which, in turn, should take orders from the superstructure.

III

What is the criterion for determining whether a social system is advanced or backward? There is but one criterion and that is, the system's compatibility or incompatibility with the development of the productive forces. We maintain that the capitalist system emerging as its substitute was advanced and full of vitality. However, being advanced is only relative, because under the capitalist system, the productive forces continue to develop, and the system begins to decline. It is then necessary to replace it with an even more advanced social system--the socialist system. Why is a system advanced at an earlier stage and then backward at a later stage? The primary reason is that the productive forces continue to develop. Therefore, if we speak of "advanced" and "backward" in absolute terms, our view is philosophically metaphysical.

It would be meaningless to talk about an advanced or a backward social system without references to the development of productive forces.

We say that the socialist system is more advanced than the capitalist system in the sense that since the capitalist system hinders the development of productive forces, it should be replaced by the socialist system. However, if we use this comparison in dealing with the Chinese society, we, first of all, must not evade an important reality. The course of Chinese history has not strictly conformed to the road predicted by Marx for capitalist countries, meaning the transition from capitalism to socialism. Our socialism was born of a semifeudal and semicolonial society. Before socialism, the productive

forces of the Chinese society were far behind those of Russia before the October Revolution. The capitalist mode of production had never been in a dominant position; therefore, it could not be called a capitalist society. These were the actual conditions under which our socialism was born. On such a basis, the new-born social system's features were certainly different from what had been envisaged by Marx for socialism.

Lenin had a clear definition of the material foundation for a socialist society. He pointed out: "There is only one real foundation for increasing wealth and building a socialist society, and it is mass industry. If there are no large capitalist factories and no highly developed mass industry, this is no socialism to speak of, and socialism in an agricultural country is even out of the question." ("Collected Works of Lenin," Vol 32, p 399) However, during the founding of the People's Republic, the overwhelming majority of the population were not the proletariat, but the broad masses of self-supporting, or semiself-supporting peasants, while the dominating mode of production was not socialized mass production, but rather one based on a backward small peasantry economy. Thus our socialist system rested on these two vastly different economic foundations: a weak industrial production system, not advanced, but nevertheless embodying socialized production, and a society consisting of a huge number of small procedures. The real material foundation accounts for the important difference between the substance of the system and that of socialism, which is the first stage of communism. The system could not end the "old system of division of work;" it could not abolish commodity and money; it could not eliminate the contradiction between the theoretical ownership of the means of production by the whole people and the actual possession of the means of production by the production collectives; it could not enable the society to effectively and directly organize production in a rational way and thus negated the regulatory role of the law of value; and, above all, it could not liberate the laborers from strenuous tasks or provide them with ample time and facilities to be concerned with, or to participate in the work of social administration. However, if the society has to advance and if a material foundation has to be prepared for the future society, it must further promote specialization and division of work in order to raise labor productivity; it must realize the socialization of production through the development of commodity production; it must take advantage of the mechanism of the market as a supplement to planned economy; it must expand the enterprises' power of possession in order to promote production...All these requirements reflect social progress in the present age, because they represent the needs of the new modes of production to oppose the modes of handicraft and small peasantry production; and to do away with the feudal regulations and feudal rights resulting from the capitalist mode of production.

Instances of public ownership of land can be found in early history. In India and Russia, the public ownership of land enabled rural communes to carry out collective farming. Yet this form of public ownership could not lead to socialism, because of the lack of a common ground. "Under this system, every small unit will become an independent organization and live in isolation."

("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 2, p 66) The complete isolation of the communes from one another produced no common, though similar, benefits. "These idyllic rural communes, though harmless at first sight, were, after all, the solid foundation of Eastern autocracy." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 2, p 67) The Krestniki of Russia had the illusion of building socialism on a foundation of public ownership of land by the rural communes without going through the stage of capitalism. Their theory was strongly criticized by Lenin, because these communes were built on a foundation of extremely backward productive forces, and their production, instead of being socialized, was only on a small scale for the purpose of being self-supporting. This mode of production was precisely the cause of social stagnation and became the foundation of feudal domination. If this system of public ownership must be called socialism, it can only be small peasantry socialism, but never scientific socialism.

In a capitalist society, the basic social contradiction is manifested between socialized mass production and capitalist private ownership. When socialization has reached a very high stage, the system of private ownership will eventually become reactionary. Only socialism can substitute the system of private ownership with that of public ownership and bring about the identity of the relations of production and socialized mass production. However, it is unthinkable that the socialist system can be confined only to the public ownership of property without socialized production; and that its system of public ownership can be built on a natural economic foundation of self-sufficiency. The present productive forces in our countryside are still very weak. Of the total annual grain output, less than 20 percent is commodity grain, and the overwhelming portion is for consumption on a self-supporting basis. At the same time, the average annual income among the rural population in our country is still very low, because not much is left after deduction for grain rationing, and the vast majority of consumer goods are produced on a self-supporting basis. In such a rural economy with a strong element of self-support, can we still claim that our relations of production are now perfect simply because of the system of collective ownership?

In industry, with the economy under the system of ownership by the whole people, there still exist contradictions between the central and the local authorities, between the state and the enterprises, and between the collectives and the individuals in the distribution of economic rights and benefits. In fact, this is still a question of the division of power. Discussions now going on in the theoretical circles on the question of enlarging the power of the enterprises to make their own decisions precisely show that under the present conditions of productive forces, there is the need to recognize certain rights and benefits for the production units. In other words, these units still own part of the rights over their own labor. In fact, the productive forces must be very highly developed before the society can directly own and use the means of production. By that time, "when ultimately it becomes the real representative of the whole society, it renders itself superfluous." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 3, p 320)

Realities have unequivocally told us that the relations of production and the superstructure of a society can never be free from the decisive influence of the productive forces. And their efforts on the development of the productive forces is the only indication for us to determine whether the productive forces are advanced or backward.

IV

In the 30 years after Liberation, every rapid development of our productive forces invariably marked the consistency of the political and economic systems, the various specific systems, principles and policies of our society with the requirements of productive forces. Once they are divorced from the actual conditions of the productive forces, thus giving rise to contradictions, the productive forces, instead of developing smoothly, might even cause stagnation and retrogression resulting in serious damages. Have not the equalitarianism and indiscriminate requisitions, the "wind of communization," and the "wind of exaggeration" 20 years ago; the mass criticism of bourgeois rights, the "cutting of the capitalist tail," and the transition in poverty in recent years clearly shown us the disastrous results? A comparison of the facts just mentioned will tell us the difference between the advanced and the backward systems.

In our country, the effects of feudalism are still serious, and the backwardness of production and the low standard of socialization have also affected many aspects of the relations of production and the superstructure. "The political influence of the small-holding peasants finds its final expression in the executive power subordinating society to itself." ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 1, p 693) For many years, the over-concentration of administrative power, the system of big and overlapping organizations of management, the bureaucratic work style, the privileges and benefits gained by certain individuals at the expense of social welfare, the feudal traditions causing these evils, and the effects of small production--all these seriously hindered the normal growth of production. Today, particularly when we are faced with the urgent need to develop production, readjust the economy and to accomplish the four modernizations; when production itself is urging to break through the confines of small production in order to accomplish socialization and modernization, these contradictions have become even more acute. The real contradiction is still between the productive forces and the relations of production, but this contradiction is not manifested in the form of a conflict between the advanced social system and the backward productive forces; in fact, it is only manifested in the conflict between the many elements of the relations of production and the superstructure which hinder the development of productive forces on the one hand, and the development of productive forces on the other. Sometimes, the effects of backwardness in production find expression in strongly worded revolutionary slogans. But this type of "leftist" deviation usually flaunts a socialist banner to oppose the progress of productive forces, the socialization of production, and modernization,

while stubbornly trying to transform the economy according to the pattern of feudal small production. Such developments, which do not show the slightest sign of being advanced can only obstruct the development of productive forces. During the 30 years since the founding of the People's Republic, there have been two severe economic fluctuations, and the "countereffects" of the superstructure, particularly in the past 10 years, brought our national economy to the brink of collapse. Have not these sharp contradictions given us enough food for thought? Are they not a reflection of the great strength of a feudal ideology and small production in the fierce struggle between the new and the old modes of production? If a social system is unable to prevent large-scale disruptions on the productive forces by its innate elements, can this system be called perfect or mighty, superior?

At the same time, the correspondence between the relations of production and the productive forces can only be relative. While the society is advancing and productive forces are developing, the contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces can go through endless changes. A system or a form of relationship which is for a time suitable may become unsuitable after a certain period of time. This calls for efforts on our part to make the necessary changes according to the demands of the productive forces and to continue to resolve current contradictions.

If we do not study the methods of resolving contradictions and, on the contrary, foist fish eyes on others as pearls, in order to preserve something--which urgently needs reform--as "an advanced socialist system," we can only bring about ruin. People may say that the issue of "the contradiction between the advanced socialist system and the backwardness of productive forces" was subjected to the limitations of objective conditions in the first place, and that this limitation made it difficult for them to see things clearly and accurately. But today, when we have been through many experiences, both positive and negative, the revival of this issue can only be an attempt to evade or conceal real contradictions so that people may overlook the need to reform the relations of production and the superstructure. If we fail to reform or to provide a wide scope for the development of productive forces, there will be no safeguard for the realization of the four modernizations. It is far from adequate to be satisfied with the advanced socialist system as theoretically proved, and to only hope for its good results. We must reform the economic structure and political system in a down-to-earth manner, resolutely abolish all traditional concepts, old customary methods and irrational systems which may hinder the development of production. We must enlarge the economic and political democratic rights for the broad masses, arouse their enthusiasm to work as the masters of their own destiny, establish a strict and clearcut legal system to safeguard the people's rights, the normal production and the social order, and wipe out the remnants of feudalism and bureaucracy. Only thus can we create a lively situation with a unity of purpose and achieve a high-speed development of socialist economy.

9411
CSO: 4005

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

'PUBLIC SERVANTS OF SOCIETY' DISCUSSED

Beijing BEIJING RIBAO in Chinese 17 Jul 79 p 3

[Article by Lin Pi [2651 0012]]

[Excerpts] In his report on the work of the government at the second session of the Fifth National People's Congress, Comrade Hua Guofeng pointed out: "To expand and develop socialist democracy, we must first of all have all responsible cadres at the various levels of government fully comprehend that the people are masters of the state and that cadres are merely the public servants of the people with the task merely to exert themselves to utilize the authority bestowed on them by the people for the benefit of the people." The fact that this question was put forth reflects the heartfelt wishes of the broad masses and expresses its important practical significance.

The "public servants of the people" of which Comrade Hua Guofeng spoke are those "public servants of society" mentioned by Marx. When Marx summed up the experiences of the Paris Commune, he pointed out, 108 years ago, that all personnel in public employment are to be "responsible public servants of society," or, in other words, the "responsible servants of society itself." Comrade Mao Zedong also always admonished: "All our working cadres, whether in high or low positions, are the servants of the people." This seems to have already become general knowledge in theory, but in the real life of today it still remains a question that will require a great amount of effort and energy for its final solution. Mentality and actions of a section of our cadres are still not yet in step with what is demanded of "public servants of society." A small number of cadres have been thoroughly poisoned by the feudal "special privilege" mentality of Lin Biao and the "gang of four," and there is quite a serious trend of acting like mandarins and overbearing bureaucrats claiming special prerogatives and privileges. The masses are very critical of such cadres as it appears to the masses that these cadres are turning upside down the relationship of master and servant.

In our party we find a glorious tradition of being "public servants of society." During the protracted battles and struggles of the revolution and at every revolutionary base, the broad masses of cadres shared the comforts and hardships of the working masses and struggled arduously, diligently and

conscientiously in their service to the people. They never complained in the least about the poor material remuneration. They had a clear conscience of being "responsible public servants of society" in the manner of the Paris Commune that Marx extolled. This was one of the sources of our strength which brought our party victory in the revolution. After the complete liberation of our country, many of our comrades remembered well the slogan enunciated by Comrade Mao Zedong at the Second Plenary Session of the Seventh CCP Central Committee: "We must make sure that our comrades continue to preserve a style of work which is modest and prudent, neither arrogant nor impetuous. We must make sure that our comrades continue to preserve the style of plain living and hard struggle." He was firmly insisting on the fine character and style of "public servants of society." In this respect we have a shining example in the life of Comrade Zhou Enlai.

However, we must not overlook the fact that after liberation certain elements among our cadres could not withstand the test of the new circumstances, could not resist the erosion by the evil legacy of the old society and in their mentality gradually developed a dangerous transformation. Little by little they either forgot or abandoned the party tradition of being "public servants of society" and instead developed a mandarin mentality and a "special privileges" mentality. There are also some people who joined our ranks with the idea of seeking official positions and status in order to gain benefits from the governing party.

We must equally not overlook the fact that after the establishment of our government, due to our inexperience, the regulations governing the remuneration and livelihood of our leading cadres had been rather inadequate. There was also a lack of democratic supervision from below with regard to those few leading cadres who exploited their authority to gain special privileges and amenities. This had a certain side effect; some people ceased to understand correctly that the higher or lower leadership duties were differences in a revolutionary division of labor, but rather, quite erroneously, linked the differences with the level of personal social status and the amount of amenities they could command, going after leadership duties as something that must be pursued as "profitable."

For their purpose of usurping party and state, Lin Biao and the "gang of four" had worked hard to recruit henchmen and knock together a factional setup. What method did they use? Their main line was to "lure people with promises of government positions, handsome salaries and other favors," that is, they bought these people by offering them official positions and granting them special privileges. One cannot say that their policy was a failure; there was no shortage of people who responded. There were those "new cadres" who were obsessed with the desire of gain, who were opportunists currying favor with those in authority for personal gain. There were also the "old cadres" who trimmed their sails to the wind, who bartered away their honor for patronages and whose minds were set merely on personal advancement. This is one side of the situation. Another side is that under the corrupting influence of Lin Biao and the "gang of four," there were some people who,

without joining the factional setup, still were aiding and abetting the political aims of Lin Biao and the "gang of four." These people acquired the entire corrupt "mandarin philosophy," that is, they excelled in currying favor with superior officials, boasting and toadying, protecting and preserving their offices and positions, relying on their ability to write official gobbledegook to drift along without doing a real job. They were also good at establishing useful personal relations, using back doors, making good use of special privileges and reaping all possible profits to "live the good life." That these two kinds of situations could arise, reveals to us clearly the social phenomenon that the evil legacy of the system of prerogatives and privileges left behind by the officialdom of the old society is still extant in our society to a very serious degree. It is a frightening force of a long tradition; once it meets up with such careerists as Lin Biao and the "gang of four," who will promote and utilize it, it will rapidly spread and become a catastrophe, seducing many of our cadres to take the road of "turning themselves from public servants of society into masters of society."

What are the "demands of the revolution" and the "requirements of work"? How are these to be distinguished from the mere enjoyment of special privileges? This question well warrants our investigation. Some suggest that we have to differentiate whether something is legal or illegal. This undoubtedly is important; it does draw a political dividing line when dealing with the question of our present reality. As the first step in correcting the unhealthy tendencies of exercising special privileges, created by Lin Biao and the "gang of four," we must first of all correct the evil practice of violating the state's rules and regulations currently in force and the illegal machinations by which people gain special privileges and benefits. However, it will not be sufficient to pay attention merely to this one point. We must also watch out for the following: Firstly, some of our regulations are legal as well as equitable, but still not perfectly all inclusive; their many loopholes are being taken advantage of by those exercising special prerogatives and privileges. These loopholes must be closed. Secondly, certain legal provisions are not altogether equitable and must be further improved to make them more equitable.

In a socialist society the people's means of subsistence comprise three categories: means of livelihood, means of enjoyment and means needed for the development or expression of all physical and intellectual potentialities (in the following referred to, for short, as developmental means). Due to the fact that leading cadres bear the responsibilities of the affairs of state and the heavy task of organizing social production, society, when distributing means of subsistence, must appropriately supply them according to needs and possibilities with more of the means of livelihood and developmental means, such as, for instance, the equipment necessary to perform their official duties, equipment for study, means of transportation, etc., so that they are enabled to perform with greater efficiency all the work entrusted to them by the people. All this will benefit the state and the people, and is within the scope of the requirements of work. The masses

are reasonable and will certainly not ask for an absolute egalitarianism in this respect. However, if in the distribution of the means of enjoyment, the leading cadres are also allowed special considerations, especially allowing them to violate regulations, giving them preferential treatment at cut prices, or even allowing them free-of-charge possession of things so that these leading cadres and their family members get means of enjoyment far beyond the level of the working masses, that would exceed the scope of requirements of work and would constitute the enjoyment of special prerogatives and privileges. The reason is very simple; their enjoyment is not a requirement of revolutionary work, it is even harmful to revolutionary work. The leading cadres of all levels are "responsible public servants of society." They are supposed to "put the concerns of the country ahead of everything and leave the enjoyments of the country as the last consideration". They definitely must not make the "enjoyments of the country" their first consideration. This is particularly so because our country is still very poor and we can provide little in the way of means of enjoyment for our working people. We must therefore watch with particular care how the means of enjoyment are being distributed and must under no circumstances allow the leading cadres and their family members to get more of these privileges and thereby repudiate the demand that they be "public servants of society."

In order to eradicate thoroughly the practice of special privileges, this misfortune for our society, sweeping the country due to Lin Biao and the "gang of four," and to prevent our public employees from "turning themselves from public servants of the society into masters of the society," we must perfect our democratic life and in addition, most necessarily, carry out systematic legislation. The fundamental principle of our legislation must be, as Lenin pointed out in summing up the experiences of the Paris Commune, to have the duties of workers in organs of the proletarian state become "positions without any profit to be gained but positions of 'honor.'" On the basis of this fundamental principle and using the forms of laws, decrees, regulations and ordinances, we must draw a clear and concrete line of demarcation between the requirements of work and the enjoyment of special privileges; we must carry out an equitable reform of the system of material remunerations for leading cadres at all levels; we must draw up strict preventive and prohibiting legal provisions against special privileges, establish and perfect a system of strict supervision, inspection and punishments. We must particularly promote to the fullest extent socialist democracy, establish a system of democratic selection, assessment, supervision and dismissal for leading cadres at all levels and conscientiously carry all these measures into effect.

The public employees of the state are "public servants of society" as well as the "masters of society." This is an important mark of the proletarian regime which distinguishes it from all regimes of the exploiting classes. The problem of preventing the political cadres of our party from "turning themselves from public servants of society into masters of society," directly affects the important questions of maintaining our party's progressive character, of maintaining the proletarian character of our regime and of

consolidating the proletarian dictatorship. In the past 10-odd years we have come to fully realize the serious harm done to our party, our state and our people by the feudal, bureaucratic, "special privilege" mentality and actions (due to limited space, this article merely deals with the problem of special privileges in the economic field and does not treat the even more virulent question of special privileges in the political field). If we do not put up a determined struggle against the "special privilege" mentality, against incorrect and heterodox tendencies and depraved phenomena and allow them to spread at will, conditions will grow more severe with the future economic development and the improvement in the material conditions. In that case our party would become divorced from the masses; the state would be mismanaged and there would be no hope for the four modernizations. Comrade Mao Zedong earlier pointed out: "We must certainly be on guard against a bureaucratic style of work and against the formation of an aristocratic stratum of society that is divorced from the people." This warning from Comrade Mao Zedong has very important significance even in our present day.

8453

CSO: 4005

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

IMPORTANCE OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM STRESSED

Beijing ZHEXUE YANJIU [PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH] in Chinese No 7 25 Jul 79
pp 3-6

[Article by staff commentator: "Promote the Study of Dialectical Materialism To Meet the Needs of the Four Modernizations"]

[Excerpts] Socialist construction in our country has now entered a new period of historical development. As pointed out by Comrade Hua Guofeng in his "Report on the Work of the Government" delivered at the Second Session of the Fifth NPC, the focus of the work of the whole nation has been shifted to socialist modernization since the beginning of 1979. This is a great historic turning point. For the present and a fairly long historical period to come, our main task is to carry out socialist modernization in a systematic and planned way. This main task demands that the comrades on various fronts should make the best use of their initiative in carrying out creative work. Of course, the comrades on the philosophical front should be no exception. In the light of the main task in the new period, therefore, the broad masses of philosophical workers should strengthen their research in the science of philosophy and conscientiously and creatively solve the many specific, urgent and real problems of philosophical theories in order to help accelerate the socialist modernization. At the same time, they should help bring about a new development in the science of philosophy and raise it to a level commensurate with the new period of socialist modernization. Here, we particularly want to stress the urgent need to intensify the study of dialectical materialism.

Dialectical materialism is the philosophical foundation of Marxism as well as the world outlook and methodology to guide us in all work. We must mentally arm ourselves with dialectical materialism and use it as our guideline in accomplishing the socialist modernization so that our world outlook and methodology will be dependable. To us, this should be a truth beyond dispute. However, this truth was wantonly trampled underfoot by Lin Biao and the "gang of four" some years ago. They recklessly distorted, adulterated and attacked the basic theory of dialectical materialism and vilified its philosophical premise--that "being is primary, thinking is secondary; and objectiveness is

primary, subjectiveness is secondary"--as "reactionary metaphysics." The law of the unity of opposites, which is the core and substance of dialectics, was also attacked as being "un-Marxist and metaphysical." They substituted for materialism with voluntarism or the theory of will to power, and used "tit-for-tat struggle" and sophistry in place of dialectics. Numerous facts have shown that the world outlook and methodology used as the foundation of the counterrevolutionary line pushed by Lin Biao and the "gang of four" are only a decadent and reactionary philosophy. What is noteworthy is that they camouflage it with a Marxist mantle with which to intimidate and deceive people. For a time, metaphysics and idealism were rampant. Unfortunately, some comrades have been deceived to such an extent that they can no longer differentiate materialism from idealism, or dialectics from metaphysics. If we will only think for a while that even such a common basic dialectical materialistic theory as "practice is the sole criterion for testing truth" would have raised doubts in some comrades' minds, we should be able to see the extent of damage to the world outlook and methodology of dialectical materialism as a result of the persecution and disruptions by Lin Biao and the "gang of four." It is quite obvious that if we want to arm our people mentally with the world outlook and methodology of dialectical materialism and to use it as a guideline in the practice of socialist modernization, we must restore the prestige of the basic theory of dialectical materialism which has been distorted, adulterated and trampled underfoot by Lin Biao and the "gang of four."

As a matter of fact, because of the obstructions and disruptions by Lin Biao and the "gang of four," many basic theories of dialectical materialism have not been thoroughly studied, or not been studied [at all], for a long time; and some of these basic theories have been even excluded from the sphere of dialectical materialism. For examples, we may mention the conceptions of matter, motion, time and space and the relations between them in dialectical materialism; the objectiveness of laws, the scope of, and conditions for the role of objective laws and the relationship between general and specific laws; the origin and the development of knowledge and the material and social bases of knowledge; the scope of subjective initiative, the relationship between subjective initiative on the one hand and objective conditions and objective laws on the other; and so forth. These questions have not been systematically studied as special topics. They were hardly publicized in general while Lin Biao and the "gang of four" energetically played up the "upside down" philosophy of thinking and deciding matters, the theory of the omnipotence of spirit of voluntarism which disregards objective conditions and objective laws.

Again, in the field of knowledge, we stressed practice as the origin of knowledge, as the criterion of testing truth, as the process of acquiring knowledge, and so forth. But even these common basic theories were trampled upon and negated by Lin Biao and the "gang of four." Their action caused confusion in people's thinking, understanding and practical work. We must

continue our propaganda work in this field in order to wipe out the pernicious influence of Lin Biao and the "gang of four." However, we must not be satisfied with only ordinary propaganda, because there are so many questions requiring our intensive study. As everyone knows, practice is possible only through certain media. The history of human knowledge has shown that practice through different media has a close relationship with the depth and breadth of knowledge and with the results of the tests of truth. Then, what kind of relationship is this? Besides, practice is "the actual determinant of the relationship between matter and the people's need for them" (q. n. ed from Lenin). Then what are the characteristics of the relationship between the process of knowledge--embodied in the actual process of practice--and the objective process? Furthermore, why are dialectics, the theory of knowledge and logics identical? And how do they become identical? These questions were very rarely seriously studied in the past. Thus, we can see that there is still a lot for us to do in the field of basic theories of dialectical materialism. We must systematically and intensively study all the basic theories of dialectical materialism before we can completely and correctly propagate the advanced and scientific world outlook and methodology of dialectical materialism among the people. Only thus can we have a dependable and firm foundation for the world outlook and methodology required for accomplishing our new task in the new period of socialist construction.

Like all societies, the socialist society develops according to the laws governing the motions of the basic contradictions in the society. However, the laws of the motion of the basic contradictions in a socialist society have special features of their own. What are these special features? In the course of the four modernizations, how should we scientifically recognize and consciously master the laws of motion of the basic social contradictions? In the new period of socialist modernization, what are the positions to be taken by production struggle, scientific experiment and class struggle individually? What are the interrelations among them? Since class struggle is no longer the principal contradiction in our present society, then what will become of its form and the scope of its role? In the course of socialist modernization, when objective laws as a scientific theory play an increasingly prominent role in providing guidance, and when the content of socialist construction in practice becomes increasingly enriched, how should we correctly understand and handle the dialectical relationship between theory and practice? While socialist modernization is in progress, the broad masses of people, cadres and intellectuals should be encouraged to display their creativity, activism and subjective initiative as they have never done before. Then, through what channel can we accomplish this task? At the same time, how should this type of subjective initiative fit in the objective conditions and objective laws in order that all these people will not act blindly? And how can we avoid that kind of initiative--which has been developed in an abstract way by idealism--and thus bring about the dialectical unity of subjective initiative and objective law as well as that of freedom and necessity? Along with the development of socialist construction, there will be changes

in people's material and spiritual lives, and in the economic, political and ideological relations of society. Then, what are the laws governing these changes? Under conditions of socialist modernization, what type of relationship will exist between people and society on the one hand and technology and nature on the other? The answers to these and other questions will become our tasks during the new period of socialist construction. The application of the basic viewpoints and methods of dialectical materialism in the study and solution of these problems is of great significance in promoting the practice of socialist construction and in enriching the theories of dialectical materialism.

In the new period of socialist modernization, science and technology will play an ever increasing role. They will do much to promote industrial and agricultural production and to prompt the changes in the economic and spiritual lives of the society and the formation of new social relations. At the same time, the development of science and technology themselves and the greater roles played by them will pose many new and important problems for dialectical materialism, and thus help speed up its further development.

In the past several decades, natural sciences have developed at an astonishing speed and provided the means for people to understand and utilize natural laws. The key to the accomplishment of our four modernizations is scientific and technological modernizations, because, without modernized science and technology, the modernization of agriculture, industry and national defense will be impossible. Boiled down to its final essence, socialist modernization means to arm industrial and agricultural production and national defense with scientific and technological know-how in order to develop socialized mass production, to transform the entire national economy and then the entire social life. The socialist system will then be built on a strong material foundation. As a result of scientific and technological modernization, the study of dialectical materialism will become all the more necessary.

The development of modern natural sciences has proved beyond doubt that dialectical materialism is the only scientific philosophy which is closely related to the development of natural sciences. Every new achievement in the field of natural sciences has been a new triumph to dialectical materialism. However, there are always some people who are antagonistic to dialectical materialism and who would use the new achievements and new discoveries of natural sciences as a challenge to dialectical materialism. Some people, even some natural scientists, have often rashly drawn erroneous philosophical conclusions on the basis of new achievements and new discoveries in natural sciences. As a result, their mistakes led them into the quagmire of idealism. Such instances are quite many in even the most up-to-date branches of natural sciences. These experiences tell us that the application of the basic theories of dialectical materialism in summing up and generalizing the achievements and discoveries in natural sciences is absolutely necessary not only for the enrichment and development of dialectical materialism itself, but also for the smooth development of natural sciences on the basis of the scientific world outlook and methodology of dialectic materialism.

Dialectical materialism is by no means a detached or isolated learning which is above practice and other sciences, because it is, in fact, deeply rooted in practice and sciences. The practice of socialist modernization and the modernization of agriculture, industry, national defense and science and technology have opened a new way for the study of dialectical materialism. We ardently hope that the comrades engaged in the study of dialectical materialism will pay particular attention to their close contact with the practice of socialist modernization and will form a solid alliance of close cooperation with the natural science and the social science workers. We also ardently hope that they will carry out more in-depth explorations of natural laws, social laws and the laws of human knowledge in order that they can use these laws to transform nature and society. Through systematic and comprehensive research, they should continue to explore the structure and system of dialectical materialism itself. They must endeavor to raise the research on this subject to a level commensurable not only with the present age, but also with the orientation of future developments. In this way, dialectical materialism will become a scientific world outlook and methodology in name as well as in fact, to serve our socialist modernization and to lead our socialist construction in its rapid development in the correct direction.

9411
CSO: 4005

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

PROMOTING STUDY OF RELIGION ACCORDING TO MARXISM URGED

Beijing ZHUXUE YANJIU [PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH] in Chinese No 4, 25 Apr 79
p 42-50

[Article by Ren Jiyu [0117 4949 1937]]

[Excerpts] I

The study of religion is an important department in the superstructure of society; it permeates all aspects of our social life.

Before the birth of Marxism, the guiding thought in all our studies in the social historical realm was historical idealism. It was impossible for the study of religion in the past, including atheism, to be truly scientific. The founders of Marxism extensively studied the issue of religion with dialectic materialism and the scientific historical materialist world concept, summarized the achievements of their predecessors, critically inherited the legacy of the various atheistic theories in history, and laid the foundation for the study of religion according to Marxism, thereby turning it into a science.

The study of religion according to Marxism is the examination of the law of the inception and development of the various religions and their move toward withering under the guidance of dialectic materialism and historical materialism; it includes the history, current condition, sects, creeds, and classics of the various religions, and the influence of religion on social history, as well as scientific atheism, the Marxist principles on the study of religion, and the proletarian policy on religion.

The old materialist atheists before the birth of Marxism advocated mechanical materialism and metaphysics in the concept of nature, and idealism in the concept of social history. It was impossible for them to make any truly scientific explanation of religion, and their atheism was never thorough. When the achievements of the old materialist atheism, supported by modern science after mankind had advanced to the capitalist society, were merely thus, the atheism of the feudal and slave societies, with their small production scale and low scientific level, naturally could

not compete against the all-powerful theology. Only the Marxist study of religion, which analyzes and examines the issue of religion by applying dialectic materialism and the scientific world concept of historical materialism, is the most thorough and scientific atheism.

The thoroughness of the Marxist study of religion on the issue of atheism does not rest on its firm stand on scientific atheism, but on its scientific revelation of the essence of religion and the objective law of its inception, development, and disappearance, and its demonstration of the inevitability of the historical inception and disappearance of religion, which are a social phenomenon. Compared with it, all other theories on religion, either refusing to recognize the existence of the objective law due to class prejudices, or failing to understand it due to limitations of the world concept, are not scientific concepts of religion. Only the study of religion according to Marxism is a true science.

II

The study of religion according to Marxism is a subject which has developed relatively late in our country, and its foundation is relatively weak. The number of research personnel is very small; even now the universities have not created a specialized department to train talents in this field, and not many books and articles dealing with the subject by means of the Marxist scientific world concept have been written. Due to such a backward situation, many people in society lack an understanding of the nature and significance of this field of science. Some ask: "Now we want to promote the four modernizations. Why do we study the subject of religion?" To make the study of religion attain its proper development, we must make the necessary propaganda to society, and explain clearly its significance. Under the current situation, we must particularly clarify its important effect on performing the general task of the new era and realizing the great cause of the four modernizations.

From my superficial understanding, it appears that the significance and effect of the study of religion may be summarized into the following four aspects:

(1) Criticizing Fideism and Obscurantism; Clearing the Way for Socialist Modernization

In his government work report at the Fifth National People's Congress, Comrade Hua Guofeng proposed the general task of the new era, drafted the magnificent blueprint for building China into a modern socialist power in the 20th century, and set forth a clear goal of struggle for all kinds of enterprises, mentioning among them "the active development of the study of religion." It indicated the concern and attention of the Party Central Committee headed by Comrade Hua Guofeng on the position and effect of religion in our social life. Our comrades pursuing the study of religion eagerly hope to contribute their effort to the great cause of the four modernizations. We may, by means of criticizing theology and wiping out superstition, remove certain obstacles on the road of the new long march.

As indicated in the modern history of China and foreign countries, any social revolution and social reform promoting modernization always held aloft the great banners of science and democracy, and included, as their indispensable contents, the criticism of theology, the elimination of superstition, and the breaking down of all forms of obscurantism and tyranny. The ideological struggle in history against theology and fideism was often a forerunner of a political revolution to transform the old system. In modern China, many progressives made rudimentary propaganda against religious superstition, and prepared public opinion for the bourgeois democratic revolution.

The emergence and development of Marxism were also indivisible from the struggle against theology. Under the influence of Feuerbach's criticism of theology, Marx and Engels converted from young leftwing Hegelians to materialists. Engels explained Feuerbach's influence on Marx and himself thus: "At this time, Feuerbach's 'Essence of Christianity' was published. It immediately eliminated the contradiction, and bluntly lifted materialism again to the throne. Nature does not rely on any philosophy for its existence. It is the foundation for mankind, which is a product of nature, to rely on for its growth. Besides nature and man, nothing else exists. The Supreme Being created by our religious fantasy is merely a reflection of our inherent and essential illusion. Since magic was eliminated, and the 'system' blown apart and discarded, the contradiction, existing only in imagination, was solved.--The emancipating effect of the book can only be imagined by those who have had personal experience. Everyone was excited, and we all instantly became Feuerbach's followers. How Marx enthusiastically welcomed this new viewpoint, and how it strongly influenced him (though still with some critical reservations) can be seen in 'the Sacred Family.'" ("Selected Works of Marx and Engels," Vol 4 p 218).

Marx and Engels continued to progress from Feuerbach, advanced from criticism of religion to criticism of politics, and from criticism of deity to criticism of law, reached the conclusion of the proletarian revolution, and produced a promotive effect on the international worker movement.

The present question is: In the course of realizing China's socialist modernization, what effect should our study of religion produce?

Realizing the four modernizations is not a simplistic economic construction task, but a social revolution of an extremely profound nature and extensive contents. It must transform not only China's entire economic image, but also the image of our spiritual life and the various realms of the superstructure.

From the historical practice of China's socialist revolution in the past 30 years, especially since Premier Zhou proposed the four modernizations in his report to the Fourth National People's Congress in 1974, we have realized that building China into a modern Socialist nation will not be all plain sailing. We will encounter not only enemy opposition, but also the resistance of all kinds of conservative forces within the people. Among them, theological thinking and all forms of fideism seriously block the realization of the four modernizations.

For 10 plus years, Lin Biao and the "gang of four" insanely opposed the great goal of the four modernizations. They were not religious disciples or theologians, nor did they propagandize theology. Yet, to usurp the party and seize power, they inherited the traditional religious concept of the will of Heaven. Lin Biao claimed that they were "talents" endowed by Heaven and by man." At the time of the great earthquake in Tangshan, the "gang of four" claimed that it was "a new omen of Heaven and Earth" and encouraged themselves and their followers with the feudal theory of the "will of Heaven."

To hoodwink the people and turn them into docile tools, Lin Biao and the "gang of four," for a long time, systematically and deliberately distorted and revised the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, attempting to turn it into a sort of rigid theology. They deliberately made each word and each phrase of the leader into absolute truths. They opposed seeking the truth from the facts and advocated blind superstition, "following every word literally." They opposed all rational demands for improving the people's material and cultural life, and advocated asceticism. They were hostile to science and culture, downgraded reason and knowledge, claimed that "the greater the knowledge, the more reactionary," and peddled obscurantism. In addition, they decorated the fideistic merchandise with new religious rituals and imposed them on the revolutionary people. They arbitrarily enforced throughout the nation such rituals as seeking instructions in the morning and making reports in the evening, rote chanting for every move and every act, confessing one's errors before the image, examining oneself before the quotations.... All these were almost indistinguishable from such religious rituals as prayers, sacrifices, and confessions. It was the unique form of a new religion.

This new religion and modern superstition brought heavy disasters to our cause. A perfectly good socialist country was almost dragged back to the Middle Ages. The people, who were the socialist masters, were turned into sinners living in repentance; superstition replaced scientific practice; philosophy and social science became tedious and rigid semantics; studying science and developing production were criminal, and seeking the truth from the facts and adhering to truth were even more criminal. The national economy was brought to the brink of collapse, and science and culture declined. Such an alarming situation was seen by the people of the entire country.

Today, we cannot help asking: How did the new religion of Lin Biao and the "gang of four" prevail for so long and incite such a religious fanaticism in so many people? This question deserves solemn handling by our theoretical workers. The reasons were obviously many-sided, but one of the important historical reasons was our inadequate criticism of feudal theocracy and religious superstition in the democratic revolution period. During the time of the "4 May Movement," the slogans of "science" and "democracy" were proposed, and rudimentary propaganda was launched. However, due to the weakness of China's bourgeoisie, the propaganda lacked depth and width, the destruction was not intensive, and the construction was not firm. The feudal patriarchal clan concept and fideistic and obscurantist ideas of

several thousand years had not been completely cleansed from man's mind, and the backward small production economy provided the social soil for the survival of such dregs of feudalism. As China's social conditions, compared with the West, are unique, so is its revisionism. The core of Western revisionism is capitalism, while that of China's revisionism is feudalism. Lin Biao and the "gang of four" misrepresented the feudal patriarchal clan concept and fideism and obscurantism of the small production economy as Marxism, politically turning the proletarian dictatorship into a feudal patriarchal tyranny, economically resisting modernization, and ideologically converting Marxism into disguised scholasticism.

Today, though Lin Biao and the "gang of four" have been knocked down, their remnant poison has not been completely purged, and the social conditions relied on by modern religious superstition for surviving and producing an influence have not been completely changed. From the discussion on the issue of practice and truth launched by the theoretical field in 1978, we see that practice is the only criterion to test truth. The moment they hear that we must start from reality and seek the truth from the facts, they clamor that it is "chopping down the banner." They continue to insist that the words of the leader are truths which must be followed literally. These comrades are not the "gang of four's" followers, and some of them even suffered its attack and persecution, but their thinking has certain points in common with its feudalism and fideism.

History and reality have taught us a lesson and made us realize the necessity and urgency of intensively criticizing theology, feudalism, and fideism.

To realize the four modernizations, we must take Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought as the guiding ideology of our cause. However, to make the scientific world concept of Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought take root completely and accurately in the mind of the entire people, we must intensively criticize revisionism in all forms, especially Chinese revisionism with its封建ist, fideistic, and obscurantist characteristics decorated in "leftwing" revolutionary terms as represented by Lin Biao and the "gang of four," and educate the broad masses of our people to regard Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought with a scientific attitude, not religious superstition. Doing so will help us prevent the emergence of conspirators and swindlers like Lin Biao and the "gang of four" and the reappearance of theology and fideism in new forms. In the process of realizing the four modernizations, we will inevitably encounter many new problems and new things which can only be solved and handled by means of a scientific attitude and scientific methods under the guidance of the Marxist scientific world concept. Though Marxism has pointed out the universal principles for us, it will be impossible to find ready-made answers to the many new situations which will arise in the course of realizing the four modernizations in China. To develop the study of religion according to Marxism, we must toil arduously. Religious piety and dogmatic adherence to words and phrases will not only fail to promote the socialist cause, but, on the contrary, ruin our party and our state.

To realize the four modernizations, the modernization of science and technology is the key. Science and culture are developed in the struggle against religious superstition. It will be impossible to realize the four modernizations and raise the scientific and cultural levels of the entire nation if we do not eliminate fideism and obscurantism and purge the superstitious ideas from man's mind.

(2) Correctly Understanding the Objective Law of the Inception and Development of Religion and Its Move Toward Withering; Furnishing the Theoretical Basis for the Religion Policy of the Party and the State

Marxism is the thoroughly scientific atheism. According to the law of historical development, we maintain that religion will inevitably wither away. However, how does it gradually wither away? What policies and measures on religion should we adopt? It calls for the conscientious study of the objective law of the inception and development of religion and its move toward withering away. If we do not act according to the objective law, we will run into snags.

In the Great Cultural Revolution, Lin Biao and the "gang of four," to pursue their conspiracy of "seizing power in the chaos," emerged with an "ultra-leftwing" appearance, completely negated the achievements of religious work of the 17 years before the Cultural Revolution, sabotaged the party's religion policy, abolished the organ in charge of religious work, and persecuted the cadres performing such work. Not only "loudly appealing for a declaration of war against religion," they also mobilized against the ordinary religious masses, banned all normal and legitimate religious activities, "swept away" indiscriminately the patriotic figures in religion, and even the religious masses, as monsters and demons, and clamored to eliminate religion instantly. Their actions hurt the feelings of the religious masses, confused the two categories of contradictions of different essences, and furnished a handful of undesirables with the opportunity to perform reactionary activities by utilizing religion. Therefore, we must bring order out of chaos on the religion front, liquidate the remnant poison created by them in religion work, and implement our party's effective religion policy in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought. For the purpose of a thorough reform, we must correctly understand the law of the inception and development of religion and its move toward withering. Correctly understanding this the fundamental contents for the study of religion according to Marxism as well as the common task of the comrades on the religion front. When our study of religion according to Marxism correctly reflects this objective law, it will produce a tremendous effect in practice, provide the theoretical basis to our party and our state for formulating a correct religion policy, arm the mind of the religion workers and revolutionary masses, elevate our consciousness in practical and theoretical work, help us avoid blind acts, and enable us to perform our work successfully.

(3) Understanding the History and Present Situation of the Religious of the Nations in the World; Making the Proper Contributions To Increasing International Intercourse and Reinforcing International Unity

Of the 4.2 billion population in the world today, 2.5 billion have religious beliefs. All kinds of religions influence a broad population. In the political and spiritual life of many countries, religion still exercises a powerful influence. The constitution of some countries even stipulates a national religion. The trend in the field of religion often produces a considerable effect on the political situation and international policy of such countries. To strengthen our friendly contact with the people of the various nations, including religious believers, we must study their religion, which is closely linked with their history and culture, and make the study activities one of the bridges for the exchange of culture and ideology. If we lack a concrete and profound understanding of the various conditions of religion, it will be difficult to adopt correct and effective policies, and carry on international intercourse smoothly.

Currently, some political strengths and ideological trends on the international scene are often manifested in the form of religion, but their political tendency and class characteristics are not all identical. We must penetrate the religious form and grasp the political tendency, and make concrete class analyses. Engels furnished us with a brilliant model in analyzing the relationship between the many revolutionary movements and religion in the history of Europe. He pointed out: "The Middle Ages merged all forms of ideology--philosophy, politics, and law--with theology, making them subjects of study in theology. Therefore, all the social and political movements at that time had to assume a theological form. In regard to the sentiments of the masses, which were completely under the influence of religion, when a giant storm was to be unleashed, the intimate interests of the masses must be covered with a religious mantle." (Ibid., vol 4 p 251).

(4) Writing Successfully the Histories of Philosophy, the World, and Literature by Criticizing Theology

Commenting on the important significance of studying religion and criticizing theology, Comrade Mao Zedong, in a written instruction in 1963, concretely pointed out that, if we did not criticize theology, we would not be successful in writing the history of philosophy, or the histories of the world and literature. His thesis is very profound. Religion exercised a tremendous influence on all aspects of social life in history; therefore, the various social classes often utilized it as a weapon of class struggle. Many class struggles in history were often inseparable from religion, and were even directly manifested as the struggles between different religions or sects, or between the established church and various atheistic trends. For many of the peasant uprisings and mass movements in Chinese and foreign histories, and for the national liberation movement of some countries, certain religious doctrines and organizational forms were utilized as a means to mobilize and organize the masses. We must, according to the historical materialist viewpoint, make concrete historical analyses of the concrete effect of religion on such historical incidents and its relationship with the national issue; otherwise, it will be difficult to write scientific histories of China and the world.

With the gradual realization of the four modernizations, a cultural construction high tide will appear in our country, and philosophy and social science will develop greatly. The development of philosophy, history, ethics, and literature and art is all confronted with unprecedented profound changes, and demands our more intensive study of religion and more thorough criticism of theology. We must assess such development tendency of philosophy and social science, and actively deploy the study of religion. Naturally, studying religion and criticizing theology are the tasks of not just our religion workers, but also those in related academic fields. We hope to deploy the study of religion and take part in the criticism of theology together with the broad philosophy and social science workers.

III

For many years, Lin Biao and the "gang of four's" cultural tyranny turned our science and culture into a forbidden area, creating a desolate and barren situation. Scientific research is an honest field, probing for the objective truth. Only when those engaged in scientific research live in a democratic academic environment where they can do independent thinking and engage in free discussion will they be able to fully develop their intelligence and talent and their creative spirit, and climb the peak of science and culture. To develop the study of religion according to Marxism, make high level achievements in this realm, and create academic works of superior quality, we must thoroughly purge all the evil consequences of Lin Biao and the "gang of four's" cultural tyranny, vigorously create a democratic atmosphere facilitating independent thinking and free discussion, and build a revolutionary academic trend of adherence to truth and courage to correct mistakes. Thus, we must conscientiously carry out the policy of a hundred schools of thought contending and a hundred flowers blooming, and implement the "three-not" doctrine. To fully follow the "double-hundred" policy and the "three-not" doctrine, we may possibly encounter resistance. After smashing the "gang of four," the Party Central Committee has done much work to purge the remnant poison of its cultural tyranny, and vigorously promoted socialist democracy. Therefore, we must advance justly in giant strides, emancipate our mind, break down all the forbidden areas in the realm of scientific research, and struggle for truth. Naturally, it is impossible to accomplish the understanding of truth at one time. In the course of pursuing truth, it will be inevitable for us to make this or that kind of mistake. Comrade Mao Zedong said: "Who does not make some mistakes? No matter who it is, he will always make some mistakes, some large and some small." ("Selected Works of Mao Zedong," Vol 5 p 207). Mistakes are frequent occurrences in scientific research, and there is nothing to fear. All one has to do is to correct the mistakes upon discovery. The process of scientific research is the process of continuously overcoming the mistakes and ceaselessly advancing. We hope that we will understand and discover the objective truths in a democratic atmosphere of a hundred schools of thought contending, and continuously climb new peaks of science.

6080
CSO: 4005

SOCIOLOGICAL, EDUCATION AND CULTURE

OBSERVATIONS MADE ON CLASS ESSENCE OF TRUTH

Beijing ZHUXUE YANJIU /PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH/ in Chinese No 4, 25 Apr 79
pp 34-41

Article by Sun Xianyuan /1327 7359 0337/

Excerpts Is there class essence in truth? This is a hotly disputed issue at present.

According to one view, there is class essence in truth. In a class society, there are only class truths, but no supra-class truth. Is it correct? No. If the contents of truth itself belong to a class, and each class has its own truth, then there will be as many truths as there are classes in the world. In that case, truth is not just one, but many. Then, everyone will be arguing for his own truth. It will negate the objectivity of truth and also the objective criterion for testing truth. Actually, truth is our correct understanding of objective matters and their laws. Though there are various differences in our understanding, which is stamped with the class brand in a class society, there is only one correct understanding. If we categorically affirm the class essence of truth, then we will have to admit the existence of subjective truth, and thereby open the door for the idealist concept of truth.

According to another view, there is no class essence in truth, because its contents are objective and constitute a correct reflection of the objective law. In terms of the objective contents of truth, this view is completely correct. Nevertheless, if we categorically maintain that truth is completely classless and negate its class aspect, certain inexplicable problems will emerge. For instance, first, social science, generally speaking, belongs to the superstructure and has its class essence. Let us leave aside the Marxist social science for the moment; even before Marx, social science contained the elements of truth. Did such elements have their class essence? Next, Marxism is a scientific truth, while it also has a clear class essence. Obviously, it contradicts the thesis of the classlessness of truth. Since we affirm the classlessness of all truths, why is there a class essence in the Marxist truth? Thirdly, if truth is completely classless and regards all classes equally without discrimination, how should we explain the fact that the truths of different classes do not regard everyone equally without discrimination, and the reactionary and decadent classes and groups vigorously resist truth?

If we negate entirely the class essence of truth, we will not be able to solve the contradictions logically. Only by recognizing the class essence aspect of truth while admitting its classlessness will we be able to explain the problems satisfactorily. In fact, truth has two aspects: Truth itself is classless, but whoever studies and utilizes it has a class essence.

I

Are there supra-class truths? Truth is objective; there is only one truth; truth itself is classless. The three statements mean only one thing: In the understanding of any matter, there is only one objective truth; there is no class truth. In this sense, the contents of truth itself are supra-class.

This principle is extremely obvious in regard to natural science. Natural science itself is classless. Molecules are formed with atoms; atoms are formed with electrons and atomic nuclei; atomic nuclei are formed with protons and neutrons; elementary particles can be divided infinitely; etc. Such scientific theses are the summation of the long production struggle and scientific experimenting of mankind, and its objective contents cannot be affected by the interests and demands of the classes. It is classless, and therefore, supra-class.

Are the objective contents of the truth of social science also supra-class? Yes. The truth of social science is the correct reflection of the law of social development. Like the law of development in Nature, the law of social development is also objective. Even though concrete social activities are all participated by individuals and controlled by definite ideologies, history develops according to its own objective law, and pursues its natural process unaffected by the interests and demands of any class; it is classless. As the correct reflection of the law of social development, the objective contents of the truth of social science naturally are also classless. For instance, depriving the expropriators and the inevitable replacement of capitalism by socialism constitute the objective law discovered by Marx in his study of the capitalist society. This law does not exist because of the preference of the proletarians, nor can it be abolished by the vigorous opposition of the propertied. The objectivity of the law is the objective source of the classlessness of truth itself.

In view thereof, in a class society, truth itself is classless; it exists independently, above the will of any class. However, our study and utilization of truth are conditioned by the interests and demands of the class, and there is a class essence. Truth is always grasped in the hands of a concrete class.

II

Social science is our ideological system and belongs in the super-structure. In a class society, the ideological system has a class essence. The reason is that, "in a class society, every individual lives in a definite class position, and all the ideologies are stamped with the class brand." ("Selected

Works of Mao Zedong," Vol 1 p 260). Therefore, every class has its own ideologies, linked with the different class interests and reflecting the different desires and demands of the various classes. Comrade Mao Zedong pointed out that, "under the condition of the existence of classes, there will be as many doctrines as classes, and even the groups in a class will each have its own doctrine." (Ibid., Vol 2 p 648). It is a scientific explanation of the class essence of ideological systems.

Then, what is the relationship between an ideological system and scientific truth?

The ideological systems in a class society are differentiated between progressive and reactionary classes. The ideological system of the progressive class has two kinds of elements: The ideology of the proletariat (representing the laboring people) and that of the exploiting class (including the progressive elements and groups in the reactionary class) in its ascendant. The class essences of the different ideological systems have their different manifestations, and their relationship with truth also varies, and it cannot be categorized.

On the issue of whether a given ideological system is truth, Comrade Mao Zedong gave a clear explanation. He said: "According to dialectic materialism, an ideology must reflect the objective reality, and it must be tested and proved in practice, before it can be considered truth; otherwise, it is not truth." (Ibid., Vol 5 p 297). Marxism is the ideological system of the proletariat. In all the social ideological systems, it is the one and only correct scientific truth. Its contents are classless, but its open declaration that it serves the proletariat denotes a class essence.

The ideological system of the reactionary class contains no element of truth. Its reactionary essence is its class essence. It takes a completely opposite position from the truth understood by mankind. For instance, after the proletariat ascended the stage of history, the Marxist materialist dialectic world philosophy emerged. Thus, in the bourgeoisie, besides the open and flagrant reactionary idealism, the mediocre evolutionism also appeared, to resist materialist dialectics. The unscientific and reactionary essences of such an ideological system are both obvious.

In view of the above, all the ideological systems of a class society are the social reflections of the politics and economy of the times. In regard to the ideological system of the exploiting class, it has two different conditions: The ideological system of the reactionary class is approaching the end of its days, at its last gasp, and it contains very little truth; in the ideological system of the progressive class, the erroneous part bears a distinct class essence; the truth part itself is classless, but the fact that it can be discovered is determined by its degree of compatibility with the interests and demands of the exploiting class. The synthesis of the different conditions forms the class essence of the ideological system of the exploiting class. If we fail to make a concrete analysis of such ideological system, it will become possible for us to infer a class essence

of truth itself from the class essence of an ideological system. This we must guard against. We must strictly distinguish the class essence of an ideological system from that of truth. At the same time, we must organically link the class essence of the ideological system with the study and utilization of the class essence of truth. Only thus will we be able to explain realistically the issue of whether the truth of social science bears a class essence.

III

As discussed above, the unification of the revolutionary and scientific essences in the exploiting class is not thorough. When it swings toward reactionism, the unification becomes even more remote. Only the proletariat thoroughly unifies the revolutionary and scientific essences. Marxism was a product of such thorough unification. It is "the most complete, progressive, revolutionary, and rational" ideological system "since the beginning of the history of mankind." (Ibid., Vol 2 p 647).

However, the objective contents of the Marxist truth are classless. Generally speaking, Marxism, first of all, is the correct reflection of the development law of Nature, society, and the thinking of mankind; its contents are objective, and have been proved to be a universal objective truth by means of the production struggle, class struggle, and scientific experimenting. Next, Marxism is not only the summation of the struggle experiences of revolutionary practice, but also a legacy of the positive results in the history of man's understanding. Only by mastering the entire wealth of knowledge acquired by mankind in the past was it possible for Marxism to be created. Thirdly, the emergence of Marxism has provided a great tool of understanding to mankind as well as to the proletariat. Therefore, the scientific truth of Marxism is a great ideological treasure-house and the common asset of mankind.

IV

Truth is objective, and it is the common asset of all mankind. However, why does it encounter resistance, and why does the struggle between truth and falsehood constantly bear the essence of the class struggle?

The struggle between truth and falsehood has two different aspects: In the realm of epistemology, it is a dispute between accuracy and error, and bears no essence of the class struggle. The policy of the hundred schools of thought contending in science basically belongs to this aspect (naturally, there are also the disputes among different academic viewpoints in the different schools). However, in a class society such struggle is constantly permeated with the contents of political and ideological struggles; therefore, it bears the essence of the class struggle. Precisely as pointed out by Lenin, "if a geometric axiom infringes on anyone's interest, it will also encounter opposition. The infringement of the theory of natural history on the outworn theological prejudices has resulted in the most violent struggles until now." ("Selected Works of Lenin," Vol 2 p 1). Copernicus' heliocentric theory and Darwin's evolution theory both encountered the opposition of the

decadent forces because they infringed on the theological prejudices which upheld the interest of the ruling class, and were declared as heresy and banned. As proved by practice, the reactionary essence of the decadent class and the truth of understanding are fundamentally opposed.

As truth itself is classless, the struggle between truth and falsehood, in the realm of epistemology, bears no essence of the class struggle.

However, studying and utilizing the class essence of truth and making truth struggle against falsehood bear the essence of the class struggle. This situation exists generally in a class society.

Truth itself is classless, and its contents are supra-class. Therefore, we must treat all truths with equality. Whether in natural or in social science, whether in China or abroad, whether ancient or modern, we will accept all truths, digest them, and make use of them. Meanwhile, we must adhere to the principle that everyone is equal before the truth. In other words, whoever violates truth and acts contrary to it will encounter the punishment of history.

However, truth also has the aspect of class essence; therefore, we cannot treat all truths with equality. Some people ardently love truth, while others feel hostile toward it. Therefore, the development of truth follows a tortuous path. Precisely for this reason, it is merely a kind of fantasy to ask everyone in a class society to act according to truth and refrain from oppressing others with power. Therefore, a revolutionary must struggle for the truth.

6080
CSO: 4005

END

**END OF
FICHE
DATE FILMED**

25 SEP 79

WB